

A supplementary list of tautonyms and miscellaneous
nomenclatural notes

HAROLD N. MOLDENKE

Some time ago I published in the Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club [59: 139-156. 1932] a brief discussion of tautonyms and a list of 228 of these bizarre "double binomials." Since the publication of this article my attention has been called to thirteen more which were not included in my first enumeration. These are as follows:

- ✓ ACETOSELLA ACETOSELLA (L.) Small, Man. SE. Fl. 446. 1933.
= *Acetosella vulgaris* Fourr., Ann. Soc. Linn. Lyon, N. S. 17: 145. 1869.
- ✓ AMARELLA AMARELLA (L.) Cockerell, Am. Nat. 40: 871. 1906.
= *Amarella quinquefida* Gilib. Fl. Lithuan. 1: 36. 1781.
- ✓ BALSAMORHIZA BALSAMORHIZA (Hook.) Heller, Cat. N. Am. Pl. 7 & 132. 1898.¹
= *Balsamorhiza Hookeri* Nutt., Trans. Am. Phil. Soc. II, 7: 349. 1841.
- ✓ BLECHNUM BLECHNUM (L.) Millsp. ex Small, Man. SE. Fl. 1229. 1933. [error for *Blechnum Blechnum* (L.) Millsp.].
- ✓ CHORDARIA CHORDARIA (Harv.) M. A. Howe, Bull. Torrey Club 51: 136. 1924.
= *Chordaria Cladosiphon* Kütz. Tab. Phyc. 9: 2, pl. 2, fig. 11. 1859.
- ✓ LUPINUS LUPINUS Rydb., Bull. Torrey Club 40: 44-45. 1913.
= *Lupinus utahensis* Moldenke [see below].
- ✓ PEPO PEPO (L.) Britton in Small, Man. SE. Fl. 1287, hyponym. 1933.
= *Pepo vulgaris* Moench, Meth. 653. 1794.
- ✓ SORDARIA SORDARIA (Fries) Ces. & De Not. Comment. Critt. Ital. 4: 225. 1863.
= *Rosellinia Sordaria* (Fries) Rehm, Ber. Natur. Ver. Augsburg 26: 49. 1881.
- ✓ SPHAEROCARPUS SPHAEROCARPUS (Dicks.) M. A. Howe, Mem. Torrey Club 7: 66. 1899.²

¹ This combination is spelled *Balsamorhiza Balsamorhiza* by Rydberg in Mem. N. Y. Bot. Gard. 1: 417. 1900.

² This combination is spelled *Sphaerocarpos Sphaerocarpos* by Haynes in Bull. Torrey Club 37: 220. 1910.

- = *Sphaerocarpos Michellii* Bell. App. ad Fl. Pedem. 52. 1792.
- ✓ STENOPHYLLUS STENOPHYLLUS (Ell.) Britton, Bull. Torrey Club. 21: 30. 1894.
- = *Stenophyllus caespitosus* (Muhl.) Raf. Neog. 4. 1825.
- TERNATEA TERNATEA (L.) Kuntze, Rev. Gen. Pl. 3: 72. 1893.
- = *Ternatea vulgaris* H. B. K. Nov. Gen. & Sp. Pl. 6: 415. 1823.
- ✓ TRIONUM TRIONUM (L.) Wootton & Standl., Contrib. U. S. Nat. Herb. 19: 417. 1915.
- = *Trionum annuum* Medic. Gesch. Malv. Fam. 47. 1787.
- ✓ TSUGA TSUGA (Sieb. & Zucc.) A. Murr., Proc. Hort. Soc. Lond. 2: 508. 1862.
- = *Tsuga Sieboldii* Carr. Trait. Gen. Conif., ed. 1, 186. 1855.

✓ In the above-mentioned article [p. 146] I made the statement, in effect, that *Foeniculum vulgare* is the oldest valid name within the genus *Foeniculum* for the plant designated by Karsten as *Foeniculum Foeniculum*. I gave as the authority and citation for *F. vulgare*, "Hill, Brit. Herb. 413. 1756." Actually, however, according to the international rules of nomenclature, the binomial *Foeniculum vulgare* was not validly published by Hill in the reference cited above, because Hill in this work does not consistently adopt the binomial system of nomenclature. The 450 or more binomials which appear in his "British Herbal" are only accidental binomials and are on this account specifically invalidated by the international rules, even though no less an authority than Druce [Rep. Bot. Exch. Cl. Brit. Isles 3: 439. 1913] maintains that whether accidental or not, these binomials should be recognized as valid. In accordance with the international rules as adopted at Cambridge, however, the name *Foeniculum vulgare* must be accredited to Philip Miller, who first validly published it in the eighth edition of his "Gardeners Dictionary" in 1768. The paragraph should therefore read as follows:

- FOENICULUM FOENICULUM (L.) Karst. Deutsch. Fl. 868. 1882.
- = *Foeniculum vulgare* Mill. Gard. Dict., ed. 8, no. 1. 1768.

A study of the synonymy of several common polygonaceous plants of this region has revealed the fact that two new nomenclatural combinations are required. These, with the synonymy of the species in question, are given herewith:

✓ *Persicaria densiflora* (Meisn.) comb. nov.

Polygonum densiflorum Meisn. in Mart. Fl. Bras. 5¹: 13-14. 1855.³

Polygonum acuminatum Meisn. Monog. Gen. Polygon. Prod. 78, p.p. (1826), apud Meisn. in Mart. Fl. Bras. 5¹: 14. 1855 [not *P. acuminatum* H. B. K. Nov. Gen. & Sp. Pl. 2: 178. 1817].

Polygonum densiflorum α *imberbe* Meisn. in DC. Prodr. 14: 121. 1856.

Polygonum portoricense Bertero ex Meisn. Monog. Gen. Polygon. Prod. 78, nomen nudum. 1826; Small, Mem. Dept. Bot. Columb. Coll. 1: 46, pl. 10. 1895.

Persicaria portoricensis Small, Fl. SE. U. S., ed. 1, 377 & 1330. 1903.

Polygonum eciliatum Stone, Rep. N. Jersey State Mus. 1910: 423 (1911), fide Weatherby, Rhodora 25: 20. 1923.

Pleuropterus cuspidatus (Sieb. & Zucc.) comb. nov.

Polygonum cuspidatum Sieb. & Zucc., Abh. Akad. Muench. 4²: 208. 1846.⁴

Polygonum pictum Sieb., Jaarb. Koninkl. Nederl. Maats. Aanmoed. Tuinb. 1848: 44. 1848.

Polygonum Sieboldi Rwdt. ex De Vriese, Jaarb. Koninkl. Nederl. Maats. Aanmoed. Tuinb. 1849: 31. 1850.

Polygonum Zuccarinii Small, Mem. Dept. Bot. Columb. Coll. 1: 158, pl. 66. 1895.

Polygonum Sieboldi De Vriese apud Bailey, Cycl. Am. Hort. 3: 1393, fig. 1880. 1901.

Pleuropterus Zuccarinii Small in Britton & Br. Ill. Fl. 1: 676, fig. 1655. 1913.

³ The use of *densiflorum* as the valid specific designation for this species is not precluded by the "*Polygonum densiflorum* Blume" recorded by Jackson in the Index Kewensis (1894), because this name was apparently never published before that time, since in the reference cited by Jackson, Blume proposes it as a variety of *P. corymbosum* Willd. [= *P. chinense* L.] and it was apparently never elevated to specific rank until Jackson inadvertently did so—long after Meisner had proposed the same name for an entirely different plant.—Vid., C. A. Weatherby, Rhodora 25: 20-21. 1923.

⁴ The use of *cuspidatum* as the valid specific designation for this species is not precluded by the *Polygonum cuspidatum* of Willdenow as claimed by Small, De Vriese, and Bailey, because the use of this name by Sprengel in 1825 was in synonymy only and did not constitute valid publication.—Vid., A. N. Steward, Rhodora 32: 223-225. 1930.

The publication of two varieties of flowering-dogwood under the generic name *Cynoxylon* by the present writer in Bull. Torrey Club 60: 56-57 (1933) was done before his attention was called to the fact that this name was not proposed as a generic name by Rafinesque in Alsog. Amer. (1838), but only as a subgeneric one [vid., O. A. Farwell, Rhodora 34: 29-30. 1932]. The name *Cynoxylon* Raf. does not start as a genus, then, until 1893, when it was inadvertently raised to generic rank by Jackson in the Index Kewensis. The generic name *Benthamidia* Spach (Hist. Vég. Phan. 8: 106. 1839) therefore antedates *Cynoxylon* by fifty-four years, and the name for the common flowering-dogwood of this region should be *Benthamidia florida* (L.) Spach. The two varieties must then be renamed as follows:

- ✓ ***Benthamidia florida* var. *pendula* (Dipp.) comb. nov.**
Cornus florida var. *pendula* Dipp. Handb. Laubh. 3: 244. 1893.
- ✓ ***Benthamidia florida* var. *rubra* (André) comb. nov.**
Cornus florida var. *rubra* André, Rev. Hort. 66: 500. 1894.

Continued monographic work in the *Verbenaceae* has revealed the fact that several new names and combinations are required for some common tropical and subtropical forms of this most interesting and complex group. Among these are the following:

- ✓ ***Amasonia campestris* (Aubl.) comb. nov.**
Taligalea campestris Aubl. Hist. Pl. Guian. 2: 625, pl. 252. 1775.
- ✓ ***Bouchea Rusbyi* nom. nov.**
Bouchea incisa Rusby, Bull. N. Y. Bot. Gard. 4: 432. 1907 [not *B. incisa* Pearson, Trans. S. Afr. Phil. Soc. 15: 180. 1904].
- ✓ ***Callicarpa incana* (Turcz.) comb. nov.**
Aegiphila incana Turcz., Bull. Soc. Nat. Mosc. 36²: 218. 1863.
- ✓ ***Chascanum adenostachyum* (Schau.) comb. nov.⁵**
Bouchea adenostachya Schau. in DC. Prodr. 11: 560. 1847.
- ✓ ***Chascanum caespitosum* (Pearson) comb. nov.**

⁵ For details concerning the differences between the genera *Bouchea* and *Chascanum*, see the monograph of the former genus by Myrle E. Grenzsbach in Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. 13: 80-100. 1926.

Bouchea caespitosa Pearson, Trans. S. Afr. Phil. Soc. 15: 178. 1904.

✓ *Chascanum glanduliferum* (Pearson) comb. nov.

Bouchea glandulifera Pearson in Thiselton-Dyer, Fl. Cap. 5: 204. 1901.

✓ *Chascanum Hanningtonii* (Oliver) comb. nov.

Bouchea Hanningtonii Oliver in Hook. Ic. Pl., t. 1446. 1883.

✓ *Chascanum hederaceum* (Sond.) comb. nov.

Bouchea hederacea Sond., Linnaea 23: 86. 1850.

✓ *Chascanum hederaceum* var. *natalense* (Pearson) comb. nov.

Bouchea hederacea var. *natalensis* Pearson in Thiselton-Dyer, Fl. Cap. 5: 200. 1901.

✓ *Chascanum hyderbadense* (Rottl.) comb. nov.

Verbena hyderbadensis Rottl. ex Wall. Numer. List 215, no. 6318, hyponym. 1831; *Bouchea hyderbadensis* (Rottl.) Walp. Repert. 4: 12. 1845.

✓ *Chascanum dehiscens* (L. f.) comb. nov.

Phyrma dehiscens L. f. Suppl. Pl. 277. 1781.

✓ *Lantana Camara* var. *aculeata* (L.) stat. nov.

Lantana aculeata L. Sp. Pl. 627. 1753.

✓ *Lippia Briquetii* nom. nov.

Lippia floribunda Briq., Ann. Conserv. & Jard. Bot. Genève 4: 237. 1900 [not *L. floribunda* H. B. K. Nov. Gen. & Sp. Pl. 2: 267. 1817; nor *L. floribunda* Phil., Anal. Mus. Nac. Chile 1891: 59. 1891].

✓ *Phyla dulcis* (Trev.) comb. nov.⁶

Lippia dulcis Trev., Nov. Act. Nat. Cur. 13: 187. 1826.

✓ *Phyla nodiflora* var. *reptans* (H. B. K.) stat. nov.

Lippia reptans H. B. K. Nov. Gen. & Sp. Pl. 2: 263. 1817.

✓ *Lupinus utahensis* nom. nov.

In his "Studies on the Rocky Mountain Flora—XXVIII" [Bull. Torrey Club 40: 43–74. 1913] Dr. Rydberg did something which, as far as I have been able to ascertain, was entirely unprecedented in botanical literature. He there proposed [p. 44] a tautonymous name as the designation of a new species. Many other botanists, as has been previously shown, had proposed tautonyms as new combinations on the basis of priority, and Huth [Helios 11: 133. 1893] proposed a tautonym, *Bambusa*

⁶ For details as to the differences between the genera *Phyla* and *Lippia*, see E. L. Greene in Pittonia 4: 45–46. 1899.

Bambusa Huth, as a new name for an old species, *Bambusa Bambos* (L.) Druce; but Rydberg's proposal of *Lupinus lupinus* as the designation of an entirely new and undescribed species was unprecedented in the realm of botanical nomenclature. The fact that he apparently used the specific designation as an adjective (indicated by his writing of it with a small initial letter) does not alter the fact that the name is a pure tautonym and is therefore invalid under the international rules. Since, according to Dr. Rydberg, this species of lupine is limited in its distribution to the state of Utah, the name *Lupinus utahensis* is hereby proposed for it.

THE NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN